

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 7-9, 11, 13-14, 16, and 20 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 8, and 14 have been amended. Claim 21 has been added.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 8-9, 11, and 13 Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 8-9, 11, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to nonpatentable subject matter.

Applicants' representative has amended claim 8 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claim 8 has been amended to recite a "method for enhancing a mouse cursor displayed on a computer display comprising: employing a processor executing computer executable instructions stored on a computer readable storage medium."

Applicants' representative respectfully submits that such amendments place the claim within the bounds of statutory subject matter in accordance with 35 U.S.C. §101. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested in view of the amendment to claim 8 (and claims 9, 11, and 13 which depend respectively therefrom).

II. Rejection of Claims 1-2, 7-8, 13-14, and 20 Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-2, 7-8, 13-14, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,661,502 to Cheng. It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Cheng does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of applicants' claimed invention.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it expressly or inherently describes *each and every* limitation set forth in the patent claim. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is

contained in the ... claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicants' representative has amended claims 1, 8, and 14 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to recite "determining at least one additional mouse cursor location locations on the generated mouse path between the actual current and the actual previous mouse cursor locations on the generated mouse path, the number of additional determined mouse cursor locations determined according to a non-linear progression of distances in relation to the current mouse speed along the generated mouse path." Claim 8 has been amended to recite "determining at least one additional mouse cursor locations on the generated mouse path between the actual current and the actual previous mouse cursor locations on the generated mouse path, wherein the number of additional determined mouse cursor locations is a function of non-linear progression of distances in relation to the current mouse speed along the generated mouse path." Claim 14 has been amended to recite "determining at least one additional mouse cursor locations on the generated mouse path between the actual previous and the actual current mouse cursor locations on the generated mouse path, the number of additional determined mouse cursor locations determined as a function of non-linear progression of distances in relation to the current mouse speed along the generated mouse path."

The claimed subject matter is generally directed to a method for enhancing the mouse cursor displayed on a computer display. The current mouse cursor speed is obtained and a determination is made as to whether the current mouse cursor speed exceeds a predetermined threshold. If the current mouse speed exceeds the predetermined threshold, an enhanced mouse cursor is generated and displayed. Many users receive visual cues of the mouse cursor's speed by the spaces left between mouse cursor images. Therefore, if a uniform distance is used between mouse cursor images, the user might not receive feedback as to increases in current mouse speed. Thus, in accordance with one aspect, the number of mouse cursor images to be added is determined according to a non-linear progression of distances in relation to the current mouse speed along the generated mouse path. Using this non-linear distribution, the user is benefited by both the increased mouse cursor images and the visual representation of an elevated mouse speed. Towards that end, the claim 1 recites calculating the *number of additional*

determined mouse cursor locations determined according to a non-linear progression of distances in relation to the current mouse speed along the generated mouse path. Claims 8 and 14 recite similar features.

Cheng is directed to a speed sensitivity feature of a digital filter. A user-selectable inertial constant is applied to fast and slow types of mouse movements and corrected mouse position data is computed using the current actual mouse coordinates and the previous corrected mouse coordinates as adjusted by the inertial constant. Although Cheng discloses corrected mouse coordinates in response to the inertial constant (particularly when the mouse movement is fast), there is no apparent teaching or suggestion regarding the number of additional mouse cursor locations. Cheng merely teaches smoothing the mouse movement to compensate for a fast type of mouse movement. Applicants' representative can find no mention within the reference directed to determining the number of additional mouse cursor locations. In addition, Cheng fails to teach displaying a mouse cursor image at each additional determined mouse cursor location on the generated mouse path between the actual current and the actual previous mouse cursor locations, as recited in claim 2. Cheng would further fail to teach that the displayed mouse cursor image is an enhanced mouse cursor image. Accordingly, Cheng fails to teach this additional recitation of claim 2.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Cheng does not teach or suggest applicants' subject matter as recited in independent claims 1, 8, and 14 (and claims 2, 7, 13, and 20 which respectively depend therefrom). Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claims 3, 9, and 16 Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 3, 9, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng in view of JP 05073257 A to Kensuke. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested in view of the following comments. In particular, Cheng and Kensuke do not, either individually or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every aspect set forth in the currently amended subject claims.

Applicants' representative has amended claims 1, 8, and 14 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to recite "determining at least one additional mouse cursor location locations on the

generated mouse path between the actual current and the actual previous mouse cursor locations on the generated mouse path, the number of additional determined mouse cursor locations determined according to a non-linear progression of distances in relation to the current mouse speed along the generated mouse path.” Claim 8 has been amended to recite “determining at least one additional mouse cursor locations on the generated mouse path between the actual current and the actual previous mouse cursor locations on the generated mouse path, wherein the number of additional determined mouse cursor locations is a function of non-linear progression of distances in relation to the current mouse speed along the generated mouse path.” Claim 14 has been amended to recite “determining at least one additional mouse cursor locations on the generated mouse path between the actual previous and the actual current mouse cursor locations on the generated mouse path, the number of additional determined mouse cursor locations determined as a function of non-linear progression of distances in relation to the current mouse speed along the generated mouse path.”

As stated *supra*, the claimed subject matter is generally directed to a method for enhancing the mouse cursor displayed on a computer display. The current mouse cursor speed is obtained and a determination is made as to whether the current mouse cursor speed exceeds a predetermined threshold. If the current mouse speed exceeds the predetermined threshold, an enhanced mouse cursor is generated and displayed. Many users receive visual cues of the mouse cursor's speed by the spaces left between mouse cursor images. Therefore, if a uniform distance is used between mouse cursor images, the user might not receive feedback as to increases in current mouse speed. Thus, in accordance with one aspect, the number of mouse cursor images to be added is determined according to a non-linear progression of distances in relation to the current mouse speed along the generated mouse path. Using this non-linear distribution, the user is benefited by both the increased mouse cursor images and the visual representation of an elevated mouse speed. Towards that end, the claims recite calculating the ***number of additional determined mouse cursor locations determined according to a non-linear progression of distances in relation to the current mouse speed along the generated mouse path.***

As stated *supra*, Cheng does not teach or suggest calculating the number of additional determined mouse cursor locations determined according to a non-linear progression of distances in relation to the current mouse speed along the generated mouse path. Kensuke fails to make up for the above noted deficiencies of Cheng with respect to claims 1, 8, and 14. Kensuke is

directed to magnifying the size of the mouse cursor in relation to the speed of the mouse movement. There is no teaching or suggestion to calculate the number of additional determined mouse cursor locations determined according to a non-linear progression of distances in relation to the current mouse speed along the generated mouse path. Applicants' representative can find no mention within the reference directed to determining the number of additional mouse cursor locations.

Cheng and Kensuke, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest applicants' claimed subject matter as recited in independent claims 1, 8, and 14 (and claims 3, 9, and 16 which respectively depend therefrom), and thus fails to make obvious the subject claimed invention. As such, this rejection should be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection of Claim 11 Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng in view of "Animation: From Cartoons to the User Interface" by Chang ("Chang"). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested in view of the following comments. In particular, Cheng and Chang do not, either individually or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every aspect set forth in the currently amended subject claims.

Applicants' representative has amended claim 8 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. In particular, claim 8 has similarly been amended to recite "determining at least one additional mouse cursor locations on the generated mouse path between the actual current and the actual previous mouse cursor locations on the generated mouse path, wherein the number of additional determined mouse cursor locations is a function of non-linear progression of distances in relation to the current mouse speed along the generated mouse path."

As stated *supra*, the claimed subject matter is generally directed to a method for enhancing the mouse cursor displayed on a computer display. The current mouse cursor speed is obtained and a determination is made as to whether the current mouse cursor speed exceeds a predetermined threshold. If the current mouse speed exceeds the predetermined threshold, an enhanced mouse cursor is generated and displayed. Many users receive visual cues of the mouse cursor's speed by the spaces left between mouse cursor images. Therefore, if a uniform distance is used between mouse cursor images, the user might not receive feedback as to increases in

current mouse speed. Thus, in accordance with one aspect, the number of mouse cursor images to be added is determined according to a non-linear progression of distances in relation to the current mouse speed along the generated mouse path. Using this non-linear distribution, the user is benefited by both the increased mouse cursor images and the visual representation of an elevated mouse speed. Towards that end, claim 8 recites *wherein the number of additional determined mouse cursor locations is a function of non-linear progression of distances in relation to the current mouse speed along the generated mouse path.*

As stated *supra*, Cheng does not teach or suggest calculating the number of additional determined mouse cursor locations wherein the number of additional determined mouse cursor locations is a function of non-linear progression of distances in relation to the current mouse speed along the generated mouse path. Chang fails to make up for the above noted deficiencies of Cheng with respect to claim 8. There is no teaching or suggestion to calculate the number of additional determined mouse cursor locations determined according to a non-linear progression of distances in relation to the current mouse speed along the generated mouse path. Applicants' representative can find no mention within the reference directed to determining the number of additional mouse cursor locations.

Cheng and Chang, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest applicants' claimed subject matter as recited in independent claim 8 (and claim 11 which depends therefrom), and thus fails to make obvious the subject claimed invention. As such, this rejection should be withdrawn.

V. New Claim 21

New claim 21 is generally directed to a method for enhancing a mouse cursor displayed on a computer display. Applicants' representative respectfully submits that none of the cited references teach or suggest the recited limitations of claim 21 and therefore, the claim is allowable.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP2587USA].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

TUROC & WATSON, LLP

/Bosco B. Kim/

Bosco B. Kim

Reg. No. 41,896

TUROC & WATSON, LLP
57TH Floor, Key Tower
127 Public Square
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731